



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Spring forth streams, the most wondrously splendid of fountains,

And water the earth with their wavelets so fair;
The most winsome of floods, from the midst of the woodland,

Break forth, ocean-cold, every month of the year,
And play, in bright flashes, through plain and through forest;

For twelve times, according to God's own command,
They must play o'er the ground of that glorious land,
All joyous and sparkling and clear.

There the trees droop with foliage and bright-flashing fruitage,

Sacred leaves of the forest that never can fade;
Never fall on the fold of the earth fallow blossoms,
The beauty of trees with their wide-spreading shade;
On the trees the full branches are burdened always,

And the fruit is renewed at all seasons and days.
In the green grassy plain, stand the green flashing forests,

The brightest of woodlands, adorned by God's might;

And that beautiful brightness shall never be broken,
Where the perfume so sweet fills the land with delight.

Forever and ever, this ever-green forest
No changes of fragrance or hue shall attend,
Till he who created it in the beginning
Shall bring all the old works of yore to an end.

WILLIAM RICE SIMS.

University of Mississippi.

INDO-EUROPEAN η AFTER CONSONANTS

and the relation of roots *stñ*, *plñ*, *dñ*, etc., to
stō, *plō*, *dō*.

THERE exist unmistakable relations between some I.-E. roots belonging to the *eu*-series and others which move within the *ē*, *ō* or the *ě*, *ǝ* series; yet the nature of these relations has been so far an unsolved problem. We have, for instance, such roots as *pleu* and *plō*, the first represented in Germanic by Anglo-Saxon *fleotan*, O.H.G. *fliozzan*, etc., in Greek by *πλέω*, *πλόος*, *πλύνω*, etc.; in Latin by *pluere*; in Sanskrit by *plavate*, *plava*, *pluti*, etc.; the second by Gothic *flodus*, perhaps **fleps*, Anglo-Saxon *flōwan*, *flōdu*, O. N. *flōa*, etc., by Greek *πλώω*, *πλωτήρ*, *πλωτός*. Other instances are: roots *steu*: *stē*, *stō*=German *Stau*de (I.-E. *stūtā*); English *stud* (I.-E. *stūtō*); Greek *στόα*, *στόλος*; Sanskrit *sthū-rā*: Ger-

manic *standan*, *stō-la stō-ra*-(Old Norse *stórr*); Greek *ἵστημι*; Sanskrit *tishthāmi*, etc.;—roots *greu*(*gru*): *grē*(*gr*)=O.H.G. *krōn* (I.-E. *grou-no*); Greek *γρύζω*: Germanic *krā(j)an*, O.H. G. *chranuh*, etc. Greek *γέρανός*;—roots *streu*: *strō*(*str*)=German *stroh* (I.E. *strogo*); Gothic *straujan*: Latin *sterno*, Greek *σπώννυμι*; Sanskrit *stṛnomi*; roots *snu*: *snē*=Greek *νέω*: *νήχω*. Roots *sku*: *ska*=German *Scheuer* (Germanic *skeu*ṛ $\bar{\alpha}$) O.N. *skuggi* (Germanic *sku*an) Latin *scutum*, *obscurus*, etc.: Germanic *ska-mō*, *ska-du*, etc. These examples may suffice; they might easily be multiplied, and it is largely a question of discretion how far one should go in identifying such parallel forms. We limit ourselves to safe working material and use only such roots as are both in meaning and in form so similar that they naturally seem to belong in the same category. Indeed they have been classed together by most writers, and where they have been kept apart, it was only on account of the one difficulty which I intend to treat here. The question is, How can we reconcile the I.-E. vowel series *ēu*, *ōu*, *ū* (*ñu*) *ñ* (*u*) with *ō*, *ē*, *ā*, or even with the *ě*, *ǝ*-series? One solution of the problem has been suggested by Schulze¹; according to him, the consonantal *u* was dropped after *ō*, *ē* in forms like I.-E. **plōu-tu* (Gothic *flodus*). This has been accepted by Bremer, among others, in his essay on Germanic *ē*²; yet it may be said that Bremer only touches upon this question as a side issue, and in the main Schulze's idea has not met with recognition by philologists. Indeed, it leaves so many difficulties unexplained, besides necessitating a rather extensive sweep of analogy, that we feel justified in looking for another explanation.

It may be well first to correct a few inaccuracies which, in looking over the literature concerned with this subject, I find in G. Meyer's 'Greek Grammar.' On page 65 it is stated that the Greek *ω*, treated in § 56, is *e* in Gothic, *ā* in O.H.G. The sentence should read, Gothic *o*, O.H.G. *uo*.—On page 66, the author says:

"Wz. *γύω* erkennen, durch Metathese oder suffixales *ō* entstanden, daher mit durchgehendem *ω*."

¹ Kuhn's *Zs.* xxvii.

² Paul und Braune: *Beiträge*, xi.

The morphological genesis of $\gamma\nu\omega$ offers no reason why it should have ω exclusively. There is no difference in formation between this $\gamma\nu\omega$ and $gnē, gnō$ treated in § 35; besides, we actually have forms of the root $\gamma\nu\omega$ ('erkennen') with \bar{a} in the Latin *gnarus*, and with \bar{e} in Anglo-Saxon *cnāwan*, O.H.G. *chnāan*.—On page 171, Meyer puts Gothic *flodu-* under root *pleu*; it should come under *plō*, if the distinction is kept up at all.

Returning now to our problem we start with the fact, that in Indo-European many roots in \bar{e}, \bar{o} have been formed from the weakest phase of other roots, with the suffix $\bar{e}, \bar{o} \check{a}^3$. The frequency of this phenomenon will justify us in advancing the theory, that *plē, plō* came from *plū-ē, plū-ō*, if we can make it probable that consonant *u* would drop in forms like *plūē, stūē, strūē*. The fact must first be emphasized that there are double consonants at the beginning of all these roots. We will then see that nothing militates against our theory, while some phenomena in I.-E. strongly point to it.

The weakest phase of the *eu*-series appears before vowels as consonant *u*; cf. Gothic *vasjan, vans*. Now there is no instance of this *u* after double consonants in I.-E., but there the $\check{u}\check{u}$ -form has been generalized.⁴ Does not this, together with *gen*.—: $\gamma\nu + \omega$: $\gamma\nu\omega$ suggest, that we actually possess this weakest form of *pleu* hidden in *plō* from *plū-ō*? Another point of circumstantial evidence in our favor we find in the parallel fate of consonant *i* in I.-E. According to Osthoff, the latter was dropped after consonants, when the following syllable began with \check{i} .

"Das einen consonanten behaftende \check{i} fiel weg, wenn die nächst folgende silbe mit \check{i} anlautete."⁵

Whether the consonantal *u* was subject to similar dissimilating influences, I will not discuss here, but we find that its history depends upon the character of the preceding consonants. Drawing my conclusions only from such I.-E. formations as must be directly constructed from existing materials, I may say

³ Cf. Brugmann 'M. U.' i; Bremer, *Beiträge*, xi; Whitney, 'Sanskrit Grammar,' p. 36; Osthoff, 'M. U.', iv, p. 366.

⁴ Cf. Brugmann, 'Grundriss' i, pp. 140 and 254.

⁵ Cf. Osthoff, 'M. U.' iv, 19.

that two consonants + \check{u} could not exist in I.-E. Considering, then, J. Schmidt's **gturtos*: *quartus* and examining the consonants of the roots here treated, I will eliminate the combination mute + mute and say that *u*-consonant was dropped after consonantal groups which contained a sonorous consonant or *s*. For these groups whose particular phonetic character insures for them a special chapter in the history of consonants in other languages,⁶ it appears natural that their history here should differ from that of mute + mute. The *s* seems to give a special energy and force of resistance to a following mute,⁷ so that a form *stūē* may well have kept its *t*, while *gturtos* lost it; and, on the other hand, the liquids and nasals are everywhere protected by their own character as sonorous sounds, and especially as last elements of consonantal diphthongs.

We have seen, how, from an *eu*-series we may arrive at $\bar{o}, \bar{e}, \bar{a}, \check{a}$; the latter alternates with $\bar{e}, \bar{o}, \bar{a}$, zero, and thus we get the \check{e}, \check{o} in *ster, στερ*, not by any process of metathesis, but by a secondary completion of a favorite series: *strē, strō* suggested a *str* and this, in some sections, a *ster, stor*. Besides, we must not, of course, suppose that the process of composition and contraction was limited to $\bar{e}, \bar{o}, \bar{a}, \check{a}$ of verbal stems, for before the ready-made nominal suffixes beginning with a vowel, the \check{u} was also dropped, and the resulting forms, made up from roots in *eu*, helped to form new centers, from which *u*-less roots would spring. Thus, for instance, we need not regard the Gothic *flodus*=I.-E., *plōtus*, or probably better *plātus*, and Germanic **flōdis*, Gothic **fleps*, etc.,=I.-E. *plētis* (in German *Unflath* and in about a dozen old Teutonic proper names) as being formed from verbal roots *plō, plē*; they may as well be derived from *plū*+suffix *ātu-, it-,* and *plātu-, plēti-* could then, in their turn, be understood by the *sprachgefühl* in different ways: they could be understood as *plā-tu, plē-ti* and help to suggest or support a verbal root *ple, plo*, or else, they could be analyzed into *pl-ātu, pl-iti* and suggested a root *plē*. We see that here as

⁶ Cf. the author's "Zur Geschichte der altfranzösischen Consonanten verbindungen."

⁷ Compare the Germanic languages, where *sk, sp, st* resist the law of consonantal shifting.

often, several circumstances coöperate in producing the same result, and I think it better, in such cases, not to emphasize any one of them to the exclusion of the others. In treating even of this ancient phase of I.-E., we must not forget that our so-called roots have been actual parts of inflected speech for ages.

There are, of course, several other reasons, why a root may move, or seem to move in more than one series.⁸ One of these possibilities is so closely related to the theory which we have proposed that we must at least mention it here; namely, the initial consonantal group is not necessarily a primary one, but it may clearly represent the weakest, vowel-less phase of a root which in its other phases contained a vowel between these consonants; then, the *eu*-(as well as the *ō*, *ē*) is suffix. Thus we consider with Brugmann, 'Grundriss' ii, p. 20, that the root *sreu* is formed from *ser*, *sr*+*eu*, and, we may add *srō* from *sr-ō*, after *ῥω·ου·*, +M.-H. G. *strām*.⁹ German *ström* can by no means be explained as a High German form; it must be one of the many Low German borrowings, and the geographical condition of Germany perhaps accounts for this one.

We must go even further and recognize also the suffix *ei*, *ī* as being capable of starting such secondary roots. From a root *bher*: 'light, heat, prepare by heat,' we have, besides the more primitive *bher* in Latin *fermentum*, perhaps *formus*, German *bärme*, *barn*, the derivative roots *bhrē*—in *βρῆ·*, German *braten*; *bhreū*—in Germanic *breowan*, *brauda* and *bhreī*—in Germanic *br-i-ya*, O.-H.G. *brīo*, modern *brei*. Also in the case of the root *streu*-, *strō*-, which I treated above from another point of view, it may be better on account of Sanskrit *strnōmī*, etc., to consider *ster*, *str* as the basis from which both *streu* and *strō* arose independent of each other. The fact is that we have here two different bridges from one series to the other and it is not always possible to tell in which way the development actually took place.

As regards the history of *u*, we have seen that it disappears after initial consonantal groups which contain a sonorous consonant or *s*.

⁸ Compare, for example, Osthoff, 'M. U.', iv, *passim*.

⁹ Cf. Kluge, 'Wb.': J. Grimm. 'D. Gr.' i³, p. 171.

That *u* should also have disappeared unconditionally after single consonants is, of course, out of the question; only as the result of a certain degree of lightness of stress,¹⁰ an early, perhaps I.-E., shortening has taken place, especially in some particles, pronouns, prepositions and the like. The root of *swa* 'so' seems to be identical with the pronominal root *sa*. The root *tu*, Germanic *pu*, loses its *u* before inflectional and derivative vowels; it is true that the second and third persons may have been shaped according to the corresponding forms of the first person, a process so common in the Romance languages. The root of the numeral *du*- may, as I believe, be recognized in the Germanic adv. prep. *tō*, *tē* (in Gothic *un-te*, *un-* from *u* as weakest phase of *in*), in Greek *-δε*, in Latin *-do*; also Latin *ad*, Germanic *at*, may in their dentals contain the remnant of *du*. As ἀπό is represented by Latin *ab* and *po*-, Germanic *af* and *fo*-, so an **adyō* may result in *ad*, *at*, as well as in *do*, *tō*. The meaning offers no difficulty; the idea of 'together,' 'union' would be the *tertium comparationis*. On the other hand, apparently the same root with another suffix developed the opposite meaning, that of separation 'in two,' and afterward generally a pejorative sense in *duēs*, *dus*=Greek *δύς*, Gothic *twis-standan*, Anglo-Saxon *tō*-, O.H.G. *zur-* (of course, the length of A.-S. *tō*- is in compensation for the dropping of *z* or *r* before consonants, and this *tō* must not be directly identified with the preposition *tō*). Cf. also German *zwischen*, Greek *διὰ*.

Besides such cases where *u* was dropped on account of a lack of stress, we find a number of parallel roots with *eu-ō* after single consonants, which must be accounted for in another way. *Den*: *dō* may be regarded as exhibiting *Lautwechsel* after the pattern of *stēu*-, *stō*-, etc., but it will be seen that from another point of view a better explanation presents itself. We have seen, so far, that *u* was dropped after initial groups containing a sonorous consonant or *s*. After non-initial groups, we find *u* occurring very frequently, but so far as my collections and observations extend, there

¹⁰ Cf. Wackernagel, Kuhn's *Zs.*, xxiv. I have not access to this article and quote it according to Brugmann, 'Gr.' i, p. 163.

is no instance where this *u* does not find its natural explanation in analogy. If this be so, and we now extend the scope of our law to all positions, we shall recognize in *deu* through *duō*: *dō* the development after a word ending with a sonora or *s*; in *reu*, *rō* the development after any consonant. But after a word ending in a mute, we expect to see an initial mute before *u* disappear; cf. *qturto-kyartos*, and similarly, before *r*, *qtrūtā*: *krūtā*. In this way we arrive at some interesting equations:

After vowels, the derivation *du-eno* from the root *du* 'worship,' remained I.-E. *dueno*-, Latin *benum*='venerated, venerable, good.'

After sonorous consonants or *s* *du-ōno* became I.-E. *dōno*-; Latin *donum*, cf. German 'verehren'='schenken.' *Du-ōtis*: δῶσις; *du-as*: Latin **das*, in *dare*, *dari* 'worshipping, offering, gift, give.' The ending *ri* of the Latin infinitive passive is derived, as I take it, from nouns in *i*, while the active endings come from consonantal stems, *opus*: *opere*=**facus*: *facere* and *opere*: *mensi*=*dare*: *dari*. The meaning was in both cases originally that of a true infinitive, expressing the idea of action in its most general sense, regardless of the passive or of the active use; compare Gothic *du saihvan im*. Only later, when these nominal cases were more closely connected with the verbal system, the forms in *-re* assumed an active, those in *-ri* mostly a passive, meaning.—In Latin *du-eria* we have the first, *nebentonige Tiefstufe*.

In the same way we have from the numeral root *du*, the following forms, besides the first *Tiefstufe* in the trisyllabic *duellum*, in *duo*, etc.: 1.—after a vowel *du* remains *du*: Latin *b* in *bellum*, *bis*; Germanic *tuis*, etc.; 2.—after a sonorous consonant or *s*, *du* becomes *d*: Latin *d*, Greek *δ*, Germanic *t*, High German *z*: —*Dellius*, 'warlike,' *deleo*, δηλέομαι, δόλος, etc., δατέομαι, German *verzetteln*; 3.—after a mute the *d* of *du* was dropped: —*kturto*: *kyrtos* = *et dueikmti*: *et ueikmti*, in Γεικοβί, Latin *viginti*, Sanskrit *vinçati*; Latin *ve-* in *vepallidus*, etc., perhaps *vēnum*, *vēneo*, Greek ὠνέομαι(?); Gothic *wi-thra*, etc.

An illustrative Latin sentence, representing the various developments of the root *du* would be: *duos et viginti bellum delebat*, which at an earlier I.-E. epoch would have read about as

follows if the Latin formation had existed: *dūōds et duei[d(e)] kynti dūēlōm dūēlē bhūat*.

Exactly as in 1. *duellum*, 2. *deleo*, 3. *viginti* we find the three branches represented in

1. *kyap*, *kup*: Lit. *kvapas*, Latin *cupere*.

2. *kāp*: καπνός, Skt. *kāpi*, *kāpila*.

3. *vap*: Lat. *vapor*; in

1. *tuer*: Germanic **pūeras*, German *quer*, Old Norse *pverr*, *pver-úð* 'rage,' τὸ πύνη, Latin *tor-queo*, German *Zwerg*, originally 'missgestalt,' 'torso'; perhaps Old Norse *thurs*, etc.

2. *ter*: Latin *tero*, *terebra* from *teresra*, Germanic *brā(f)an*, Lat. *ter-gum*, τρεπω, etc.

3. *uer*: Latin *verro*, *verrunco*, *ver-to*, Germanic *werran* 'verwirren' *werpan* 'turn.'

Not all my materials are as self-evident as these; the original conditions were, of course, disturbed by cross-influences. Additional cases might be quoted, but the law I believe is sufficiently established.

GUSTAF E. KARSTEN.

Indiana University.

RECENT OPINION CONCERNING THE RIDDLES OF THE EXETER BOOK.

Two specialists have recently spoken on this subject, Sievers in *Anglia*, and George Herzfeld in "Die Räthsel des Exeterbuches und ihr Verfasser" (Berlin, Mayer & Müller, 1890). The object of this note is merely to call attention to the conclusions reached by these investigators.

1. Sievers would assign the riddles to an earlier date than that of the Cynewulfian writings. He says (*Anglia* xiii, 19):

"Das gesamtresultat dieser sich gegenseitig stützenden erwägungen ist also, dass die erste aufzeichnung der rätsel in die periode des *i* und die noch früher zu ende gehende periode des auslautenden *-b*, des *a* vor nasalen und des unumgelauteten *a* vor *u* fällt; also auch vermutlich in die zeit vor Cynewulf, der seinen namen selbst mit *e* schreibt. Man müsste denn, um die annahme Cynewulf sei der verfasser der rätsel, festzuhalten, weiterhin es für wahrscheinlich erklären wollen, dass Cynewulf in seiner jugend *i* und im alter *e* geschrieben habe."

2. Herzfeld inclines to think that they should be ascribed to Cynewulf. His words are:

"Nach meiner Ansicht ist es zwar nicht unbedingt sicher, aber doch in hohem Grade wahr-